

CHAPTER 2

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE NORTHWEST REGIONAL POWER FACILITY EIS

2.1 Introduction

This part of the Final EIS includes written comments received on the Draft EIS, oral comments made at the November 15, 1995 public meeting in Creston, and the lead agencies' responses to those comments. This Chapter is organized into two parts: 1) general response; and 2) written comments and specific responses. The general response addresses the issue of the level of environmental review conducted for the natural gas pipeline. In some cases, responses to specific comments cross reference the general response.

2.2 General Response #1- Level of Analysis for the Natural Gas Pipeline

The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) and the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in conjunction with the cooperating federal agencies determined that the detailed environmental analysis of the natural gas pipeline was beyond the scope of this EIS, and that a focused environmental review of the potential environmental impacts of the natural gas pipeline would be completed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). As stated in Section 1.6 (Issues Beyond the Scope of the EIS) of the Final EIS, "FERC is responsible for the review and approval of all interstate pipelines before construction, which is accomplished by issuing a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. When an application for the gas pipeline is submitted, FERC will conduct a NEPA review of its potential impacts. BPA plans to be a cooperating agency in FERC's gas pipeline review and the environmental impacts associated with the gas pipeline will be considered by BPA before making a final decision on the project after FERC's analysis is complete. EFSEC, however, will have no further formal role in evaluating the gas pipeline application.

Although not a formal part of the scope of this EIS, information about the natural gas pipeline and its potential environmental impacts has been included where available. This provides as complete a view as possible of the full range of actions associated with the development of the NRPF. The level of information available is not as detailed for the pipeline as for the NRPF and its ancillary facilities."

The construction of the natural gas pipeline would likely require one or more state and local permits, which would require compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Therefore, a focused environmental review of the potential environmental impacts of the natural gas pipeline may also be completed by a state or local agency (e.g., the Department

of Ecology, Lincoln County, or Spokane County).

The information regarding the natural gas pipeline and its potential environmental impacts was drawn from the PGT pipeline routing study, some of which was included in as Appendix B of the Draft EIS. To better understand the potential environmental effects which FERC will have to address in their NEPA review please refer to Appendix A (Potential Environmental Impacts and Previously Employed Mitigation Options for Natural Gas Transmission Pipelines) of this Final EIS. This additional information more accurately characterizes the general range of impacts associated with gas pipeline projects by drawing on FERC's extensive experience in preparing and conducting numerous NEPA analyses for natural gas pipeline projects in the West. While it does not mean that all of the impacts listed will occur nor all of the mitigation is appropriate for this area, it does represent the types of impacts likely to be examined and mitigation FERC is likely to select from in the site-specific gas pipeline environmental review.

In addition, FERC's staff have developed standard mitigation plans and procedures for erosion control/restoration and wetland/waterbody construction (see Appendix B of the Final EIS), which are routinely made a part of the certificate conditions for interstate gas pipelines.

It should be noted that the gas pipeline will not be built or sited until a decision has been made to proceed with the proposed NRPF, which may not be built for up to ten years. Therefore, preparing a detailed EIS on the natural gas pipeline at this time would not be feasible.

2.3 Written Comments and Responses

This section includes written comments and responses to those comments. Table 2-1 is an index of the comments received.

TABLE 2-1 Index to Comments on the Northwest Regional Power Facility Draft EIS	
LETTER	COMMENTS
	Federal Agencies
A	Robert Christensen, USDI Bureau of Reclamation
B	Charles Polityka, USDI Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
C	Richard Parkin, EPA Region 10
	State Agencies
D	Robert G. Whitlam, State Archaeologist
E	Tony Eldred, Dept of Fish and Wildlife
F	Marvin Vialle, Department of Ecology
G	Chris Regan, WA State Parks and Recreation Commission
H	Attorney General of Washington
	Public
I	Larry Goodrow, Spokane Tribe of Indians
J	Mary and John McCaughey (EFSEC)
K	Mary and John McCaughey (BPA)
L	Bonnie Jensen, Mayor
M	Darryl Peeples and Charles Lean
N	KVA Resources and CSW Energy Comments on the NRPF Draft EIS
O	KVA Resources and CSW Energy Editorial Suggestions for the NRPF Draft EIS
P	Mr and Mrs Blake Angstrom
Q	Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Bean and Sons
R	Craig Brougher, Pangaea International
S	Jack Tenter to Jason Zeller
T	Patti Lowe, Executive Director, Greenhouse Action
U	Rachael Paschal, Center for Environmental Law and Policy
V	Jerry Robinson
W	John Cassady, Pacific Gas Transmission Company
X	Public meeting, Creston, Washington, on November 15, 1995
	Mr. Purvis
	Pete Bean
	Pete Crow
	Joe Bean
	Jim Hall
	Craig Brougher
	Mrs. Bean
	Mr. Purvis
	Mayor Haydon
	Mr. Purvis
	Joe Bean
	Jim Hall
	Mr. Purvis